



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/776,054	02/02/2001	David M. Payne	10002870-1	9358

7590 06/17/2004
HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, LEE

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2682	7

DATE MAILED: 06/17/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/776,054

Applicant(s)

PAYNE ET AL.

Examiner

LEE NGUYEN

Art Unit

2682

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 May 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 and 28-35 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 6 and 7 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5, 8-14 and 28-35 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

This action is responsive to the communication filed 5/18/2004.

Claims 15-27 have been canceled. Claims 1-14 and 28-35 remain in prosecution.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to

consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

3. Claims 1-5, 8-10, 13-14, and 28-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Monroe (US 2002/0065076) in view of Shupe et al. (US 6,283,775).

Regarding claim 1, Monroe teaches a mobile phone handset, comprising: a multi-purpose connection adaptor 34 (figs. 4B, 13-15) configured to connect said mobile phone handset to at least two of a plain ordinary telephone line, a local area network and one or more computing devices, see [0040], [0045], [0047]. Monroe fails to teach that the multi-purpose connection adaptor includes a single multi-purpose connector configured to alternately accommodate a connector for the plain ordinary telephone line and a connector for the local area network. In contrast, Shupe teaches that a single jack which may be both electrically and physically configured to accept both a phone line connection via an RJ-11 plug and a computer network connection via an RJ-45 plug (fig. 7, col. 3, 46-50, col. 5, 60-66). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the single jack of

Shupe to the mobile handset of Monroe in order to reduce the size and shape of the device.

Regarding claim 2, Monroe also teaches a network controller 60 configured to allow said mobile phone handset to communicate with said local area network (fig. 13).

Regarding claim 3, Monroe also teaches a processor control subsection 60 (fig. 13) configured to control operations of said mobile phone handset; a line detector configured to send said processor control subsection a local area network present signal if said connector is connected to said local area network, see [0010].

Regarding claims 4, 16, Monroe also teaches that said processor control subsection 60, 122 (figs. 13-15) is configured to allow a user of said mobile phone handset to access said local area network through a user interface of said mobile phone handset, see [0059], [0060].

Regarding claim 5, Monroe also teaches a network controller 128 (fig. 15) configured to allow said mobile handset to communicate with said one computing device, each of said one or more computing devices inherently having a device network controller configured to communicate with said network controller using a network communication protocol, see [0060].

Regarding claim 8, Monroe teaches a plain ordinary telephone transmitter receiver circuitry 128 (fig. 15) configured to send and receive telephone call signals to and from said plain ordinary telephone line 133.

Regarding claims 9-10, Monroe also teaches a processor control subsection configured to control operations of said mobile phone handset; and a line detector configured to send said processor control subsection a plain ordinary telephone line present signal if said connector is connected to said plain ordinary telephone line and allow the user of said mobile phone handset to place a call through said plain POTS (see figure 2D, numerals 20, 24).

Regarding claim 13, Monroe also teaches a modem (Data Modem, fig. 13) configured to communicate with said one computer device through said POTS; and a line detector 60 configured to send said processor control subsection a POTS present signal if said connector is connected to said one computer device, see [0058].

Regarding claim 14, Monroe also teaches that said processor subsection 60 (fig. 13) is configured to allow a user of said mobile phone handset to access a wide area network through a user interface of said one

computing device (DATA MODEM) if said connector is connected to said one computer device (fig. 2D, numerals 23, 27).

Regarding claims 28-29, Monroe as modified by Shupe teaches the connector socket which comprises a male plug RJ-11 for the plain ordinary telephone line and a male plug RJ-45 for the LAN (col. 3, 46-50 of Shupe).

Regarding claim 30, Monroe as modified by Shupe also teaches that the socket securely holds the male plugs of the LAN and POT (col. 3, 46-50 and figure 7 of Shupe).

Regarding claim 31, the claim is interpreted and rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 9.

Regarding claim 32, Monroe as modified teaches that the multi-purpose connection adaptor is attached to the mobile phone, and does not teach the conventional of implementing said multi-purpose connection adaptor within the mobile phone. However, according to Shupe, the multi-purpose connection adaptor can be implemented in a communication device (col.1, 17-19). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the single jack of Shupe within the mobile handset of Monroe in order to reduce the size and shape of the device.

Regarding claim 33, Monroe teaches a mobile phone handset, comprising: a multi-purpose connection adaptor 34 (figs. 4B, 13-15) configured to connect said mobile phone handset to at least two of a plain ordinary telephone line, a local area network and one or more computing devices, see [0040], [0045], [0047]. Monroe fails to teach that the multi-purpose connection adaptor includes a single multi-purpose connector configured to alternately accommodate a connector for the plain ordinary telephone line and a connector for the local area network. In contrast, Shupe teaches that a single jack which may be both electrically and physically configured to accept both a phone line connection via an RJ-11 plug and a computer network connection via an RJ-45 plug (fig. 7, col. 3, 46-50, col. 5, 60-66). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the single jack of Shupe to the mobile handset of Monroe in order to reduce the size and shape of the device.

Regarding claim 34, the claims is interpreted and rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 9.

Regarding claim 35, the claims is interpreted and rejected for the same reason as set forth in claims 28-29.

4. Claims 11-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Monroe.

Regarding claims 11-12, Monroe as modified fails to teach dialing according to stored numbers and displaying caller ID. It is taken official notice that the art of dialing according to stored numbers and displaying caller ID is conventionally well known. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide dialing according to stored numbers and displaying caller ID in order to dial call quicker and to screen unwanted calls.

Allowable Subject Matter

1. Claims 6-7 were allowed.


Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-5, 8-14, 28-35 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to LEE NGUYEN whose telephone number is (703)-308-5249. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 AM - 4:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, VIVIAN CHIN can be reached on (703) 308-6739. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

 6/11/04
LEE NGUYEN
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2682